

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the official action of October 17, 2006, wherein claims 1 and 6-38 were purported to be rejected. However, no basis for rejection of claim 13 was stated in the action. Therefore, any rejection of claim 13 in a further action shall be non-final.

This paper is timely filed, as it is accompanied by a petition for a one-month extension of time to file a response and the requisite extension fee.

In response, claims 1, 13, 23, and 32 are amended to further define the invention and claims 8-10, 18-20, and 37-38 are amended for consistent terminology as a result of the amendments to claims 1, 13, 23, and 32. Claims 11 and 12 are canceled. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 13, 23, and 32 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed, for example, support may be found in paragraph [0016]. No new matter is added. As a result, claims 1, 6-10, and 13-38 remain pending and at issue

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1 and 6-28 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,475,378 to Kaarsoo et al. (“Kaarsoo”) in view of one or more of U.S. Patent No. 6,010,064 to Umeda et al. (“Umeda”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,734,907 to Jarossay et al. (“Jarossay”). Reconsideration is requested.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2143. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Each of pending claims 1, 6-10, and 13-28 recites a method for controlling electronic parcel package compartments systems comprising, *inter alia*, “transmitting data appertaining to an anomaly from one parcel compartment to the server; and transmitting the data [appertaining to the anomaly] to all parcel compartment systems.” The cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least this limitation.

Kaarsoo fails to disclose or suggest transmitting data appertaining to an anomaly in one parcel compartment system to all parcel compartment systems, nor was Kaarsoo cited as disclosing such an element. Kaarsoo discloses an electronic access control mail box system that includes a mail box locker 12 electronically coupled to a local control unit 14 and a card reader 16. The locker 12 may include an array of sixteen mailbox compartments 18, each having a door with an electronically operable locking mechanism. The local control unit 14 processes digital inputs and outputs for alarm monitoring purposes. The local control unit 14 logs attempts to compromise an alarm input for analysis and action by an operator. See Kaarsoo, col. 3, lines 55-67. A computer workstation 24 processes alarms and “logs the event” and then “determines the appropriate action to take.” See Kaarsoo, col. 5, lines 3-6. The actions that the computer workstation 24 takes in response to an alarm include “classify[ing] the change in status” and “notify[ing] the operator or determining that the status change is not an alarm and requires no further action.” See Kaarsoo, col. 5, lines 6-9. However, Kaarsoo does not disclose or suggest the computer workstation 24 transmitting alarm information to the other mailbox compartments 18. Thus, Kaarsoo fails to disclose or suggest transmitting data appertaining to an anomaly from one parcel compartment to the server; and transmitting the data appertaining to the anomaly to all parcel compartment systems, as is recited by each of pending claims 1, 6-10, and 13-38.

Likewise, Umeda fails to disclose or suggest transmitting data appertaining to an anomaly from one parcel compartment to the server; and transmitting the data appertaining to the anomaly to all parcel compartment systems, nor was Umeda cited as disclosing such an element. Umeda discloses a commodity distributing locker apparatus including, *inter alia*, an operation screen 1 (a color LCD display), a magnetic card reader 20, a printer 30, a scanner 60, a control section 70, and a plurality of lockers 80. A user touches the operation screen to enter data, such as member or non-member customer information, name and/or telephone number. The device then unlocks a locker to allow the user to deposit an order sheet and film

in the locker. See Umeda, col. 3, line 21 to col. 4, line 7. The Umeda device also accepts passwords to open the lockers and checks for a correct password. If an incorrect password is entered, the Umeda device checks the password again. See Umeda, col. 8, lines 17-19. Umeda teaches only one option when an incorrect password is entered and that option is to ask for a re-entry of the password. See Umeda, Figs. 7 and 8; col. 7, lines 45-47; and col. 8, lines 17-19. Umeda fails to teach transmitting any error or anomaly information to each of the lockers 80. Thus, Umeda does not disclose or suggest transmitting data appertaining to an anomaly from one parcel compartment to the server; and transmitting the data appertaining to the anomaly to all parcel compartment systems, as is recited by each of pending claims 1, 6-10, and 13-38.

Jarossay also fails to disclose or suggest transmitting data appertaining to an anomaly from one parcel compartment to the server; and transmitting the data appertaining to the anomaly to all parcel compartment systems, nor was Jarossay cited as disclosing such an element. In fact, Jarossay fails to disclose a parcel compartment system of any sort. Thus, Jarossay cannot disclose or suggest transmitting data appertaining to an anomaly from one parcel compartment to the server; and transmitting the data appertaining to the anomaly to all parcel compartment systems, as is recited in each of pending claims 1, 6-10, and 13-38.

Because the cited art fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of pending claims 1, 6-10, and 13-38, none of pending claims 1, 6-10, and 13-38 can be rendered obvious by any combination thereof. Thus, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6-38.

Conclusion

The applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing amendments, consideration of the foregoing remarks, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6-38.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

By: 
Michael A. Chinlund
Reg. No. 55,064
Agent for Applicants
Customer No. 04743

February 19, 2006

6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300